

VZCZCXYZ0013
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHBM #0268 0681340
ZNY CCCCC ZZH
O 091340Z MAR 07
FM AMEMBASSY BUCHAREST
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 6219
INFO RUEHXP/ALL NATO POST COLLECTIVE IMMEDIATE
RUEHAK/AMEMBASSY ANKARA IMMEDIATE 0584
RUEHTH/AMEMBASSY ATHENS IMMEDIATE 0972
RUEHLO/AMEMBASSY LONDON IMMEDIATE 0203
RUEHNY/AMEMBASSY OSLO IMMEDIATE 0518
RUEHSF/AMEMBASSY SOFIA IMMEDIATE 4882

C O N F I D E N T I A L BUCHAREST 000268

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

STATE FOR EUR/RPM

E.O. 12958: DECL: 03/08/2010
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [KCFE](#) [NATO](#) [GR](#) [TU](#) [NO](#) [UK](#) [CA](#) [BU](#) [RO](#)
SUBJECT: CFE CROSS-GROUP STATIONING LANGUAGE: OPTION ONE
BEST

REF: A. STATE 28280
[1](#)B. HLTF-N(2006)0023-REV8

Classified By: Political Counselor Ted Tanoue for
Reasons 1.5(b) and (d).

(C) Polmiloff on March 8 discussed ref A with Director for Non-Proliferation, Arms Control and Combating Terrorism (and HLTF rep) Mihaela Vasiu and CFE Desk Officer Dana Marca. They agreed option one was the best, and added that Allies should avoid opening the door for Germany to reinsert "formally" or offer up any other modifiers into paragraph 5 of ref B which could reopen discussion over how to package the consolidated paper's language for Russia's benefit. As Romania's fall back position, they would prefer option 2 over option 3, but even that would run the risk of reopening the debate. Vasiu and Marca agreed that the reference to NATO's 1997 policy statement -- while accurate -- did not address the issue of cross-group stationing nor address Russia's question. They also noted that while the 1997 reference was probably unnecessary in the context of the paragraph, it was not a problem unless it continued to distract from what should be the essence of the HLTF paper -- CFE not NATO.
TAUBMAN